

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/788,002	02/16/2001	Leo Driessen	CS1089#SP 3636		
75	7590 07/09/2004 EXAMIN		INER		
The Black & Decker Corporation			TRAN, LOUIS B		
701 East Joppa Road Towson, MD 21286			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
10,75011, 1712			3721		
			DATE MAILED: 07/00/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4			<u> </u>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/788,002	DRIESSEN, LEO	
, and y	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Louis B Tran	3721	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE THE FILED 04 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE FILED OF THE FILED OF A STATE OF THE PLACE THE PLACE THE PLACE OF A STATE O	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 times.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TI e date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ng date of the final rejection. RE FINAL REJECTION. RE 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The appropriation of the final originally set in the final	on. See MPEP ropriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>04 June 2004</u> . App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			h in
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) [] they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of t	inally rejected claim	ıs.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:			
_			
			ع

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that screws cannot be described as a "tool-less means". However, Examiner contends that a user could apply bolts by hand which would fulfill the "tool-less" requirement. Therefore, 112 rejections and 102/103 rejections are proper. Examiner still holds "the other one" to be indefinite in claim 11.

JOHN SIPOS PRIMARY EXAMINER